REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 12, 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Litzkow et al. (*Checkpoint and Migration of UNIX Processes in the Condor Distributed Processing System*, hereinafter "Litzkow").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Litzkow. Applicant respectfully points out that Litzkow teaches re-linking submitted programs to include a checkpointing library and then calling the routines in the checkpointing library by using system calls (see Litzkow, page 1, section 1 and page 5-6, section 3.4.1).

In contrast, the present invention dynamically links the interceptor library by setting an **environment variable** and then calling the system routines from the interceptor library by using pointers gathered by and saved in the interceptor library (see page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 6 of the instant application). This is beneficial because the program does not need to perform an entire static linking process and because system calls are avoided. This enables an interceptor library to be attached to a program at program startup time by simply setting an environment variable. In contrast, Litzkow requires a checkpoint library to be attached prior to compilation and linking of the program. There is nothing within Litzkow, either explicit or implicit, which suggests linking the interceptor library by setting an environment variable and then calling the system routines from the interceptor library by using pointers gathered by and saved in the interceptor library.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention links the interceptor library by setting an environment variable and then calls the system routines from the interceptor

library by using pointers gathered by and saved in the interceptor library. These amendments find support on page 6, line 25 to page 7, line 6 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _(signature)_

Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: January 28, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-2914
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665